

1 DENISE M. MINGRONE  
2 (STATE BAR NO. 135224)  
3 dmingrone@orrick.com  
4 ROBERT L. URIARTE  
5 (STATE BAR NO. 258274)  
6 ruriarte@orrick.com  
7 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
8 1000 Marsh Road  
9 Menlo Park, CA 94025-1015  
10 Telephone: +1 650 614 7400  
11 Facsimile: +1 650 614 7401

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counterdefendant  
SYNOPSYS, INC.

JENNIFER LEE TAYLOR  
(STATE BAR NO. 161368)  
JTaylor@mofo.com  
JOYCE LIOU  
(STATE BAR NO. 277720)  
JLiou@mofo.com  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
425 Market Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
Telephone: +1 415 268-7000  
Facsimile: +1 415 268-7522

Attorneys for  
Defendant/Counterclaimant  
**UBIQUITI NETWORKS INC.**

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

13 | SYNOPSYS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

15

16 UBIQUITI NETWORKS, INC., UBIQUITI  
17 NETWORKS INTERNATIONAL LIMITED,  
CHING-HAN TSAI, and DOES 1-20, inclusive,

## Defendants

**Case No. 3:17-cv-00561-WHO**

**JOINT STIPULATION AND  
PROPOSED ORDER RE  
UBIQUITI NETWORKS, INC.'S  
MOTION TO STRIKE  
SYNOPSYS, INC.'S FIFTEEN  
AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

Date: May 17, 2017  
Time: 2:00 p.m.  
Place: Courtroom 2, 17th Floor  
Judge: Hon. William H. Orrick

21 || UBIQUITI NETWORKS, INC.

### Counterclaimant,

V<sub>3</sub>

SYNOPSYS, INC.,

## Counterdefendant.

1 Counsel for Plaintiff/Counterdefendant Synopsys, Inc. and counsel for  
2 Defendant/Counterclaimant Ubiquiti Networks, Inc. (“Ubiquiti”), hereby stipulate to (and ask the  
3 Court to take note of) the following:

4       1.       On April 11, 2017, Ubiquiti filed a motion to strike Synopsys' fifteen affirmative  
5       defenses in Synopsys' answer to Ubiquiti's counterclaims. Dkt. 32.

6 2. Synopsys' opposition to that motion to strike would have been due on April 25,  
7 2017. But rather than file an opposition, Synopsys elected to file a first amended answer, as a  
8 matter of course, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a)(1). *See* Dkt. 37.

9 3. Synopsys' first amended answer supersedes its original answer.

10       4.     Because Ubiquiti's motion to strike is directed at the now-superseded original  
11 answer, Ubiquiti's motion to strike has become moot.

12       5.      Counsel for Synopsys and Ubiquiti request that the Court deny Ubiquiti's motion  
13 to strike as moot.

14 6. Counsel for Synopsys and Ubiquiti agree that it is no longer necessary to address  
15 Ubiquiti's motion to strike at the currently-scheduled hearing of May 17, 2017.

16 || Signatures for counsel are on the next page.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

20

1 Dated: April 25, 2017

2 DENISE M. MINGRONE  
3 ROBERT L. URIARTE  
4 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SULTCLIFFE  
5 LLP

6  
7 By: /s/Denise M. Mingrone  
8 DENISE M. MINGRONE

9  
10 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
11 SYNOPSYS, INC.

12 Dated: April 25, 2017

13 JENNIFER LEE TAYLOR  
14 JOYCE LIOU  
15 AMANDA D. PHILLIPS  
16 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

17 By: /s/Jennifer Lee Taylor  
18 JENNIFER LEE TAYLOR

19 Attorneys for Defendant  
20 UBIQUITI NETWORKS INC.

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 **CIVIL LOCAL RULE 5-1(i)(3) ATTESTATION**

29 I hereby attest that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from each  
30 of the other signatories hereto.

31 Dated: April 25, 2017

32 By: /s/Denise M. Mingrone  
33 DENISE M. MINGRONE

## **[PROPOSED] ORDER**

Pursuant to the parties' stipulation, Ubiquiti's Motion to Strike (Dkt. 32) is DENIED as moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

---

Hon. William H. Orrick  
U.S. District Judge